The distinguished Senator from Vermont was at that fateful meeting in the White House when the President informed us of the situation then developing in the Dominican Republic. Because we are both bound by the executive nature of the meeting, we cannot say too much, but we were aware of what happened at the time, and we both gave our full endorsement to the policy undertaken in connection with the President's announcement to us in the Cabinet Room.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me express the hope I expressed for the Dominican Republic, that it will apply to all the Latin American countries in the Western Hemisphere. I do not believe that we should undertake to dictate to them just what kind of government they should live under, or whom they should have to head that government so long as it does not actually threaten the security of the United States.

I am still not convinced that what went on in the Dominican Republic in April threatened the security of the United States. It seemed to me that there would have been more bloodshed during that rebellion had the President not intervened. However, as I said before, I believe that he received some advice, as has been pointed out by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which caused us to make more mistakes than we otherwise might have made, and which delayed plans for the establishment of a popular government in that country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to some extent the discussion relates to events in the past.

Now we are faced with the present.

It seems as though there is a good possibility—although nothing is sure in this world any more—of a reasonably good government coming out of the situation in the Dominican Republic.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for yielding to me, and if he will allow me just this once, to suggest the absence of a quorum, without his losing the right to the floor, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9221) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16 and 31 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 24, and 62 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10323) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 948. An act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act;

H.R. 10014. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives, and the act of June 27, 1956, relating to office space in the States of Senators; and

H.R. 10874. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to eliminate certain provisions which reduce spouses' annuities, to provide coverage for tips, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the railroad retirement tax rates.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the bill we are considering today accomplishes major reforms in our immigration policy. This bill is not concerned with increasing immigration to this country, nor will it lower any of the high standards we apply in selection of immigrants. The basic change it makes is the elimination of the national origins quota system, in line with the recommendations of the last four Presidents of the United States, and Members of Congress from both parties.

For 41 years, the immigration policy of our country has been crippled by this system. Because of it we have never been able to achieve the annual quota use authorized by law. We have discriminated in favor of some people over others, contrary to our basic principles as a nation, simply on the basis of birth. We have separated families needlessly. We have been forced to forego the talents of many professionals whose skills were needed to cure, to teach and to enhance the lives of Americans.

The present law has caused thousands of instances of personal hardship, of which every Senator is aware. Several times Congress has tried to correct the twisted results of the national origins system through emergency legislation. Six times between 1948 and 1962 laws were passed for the admission of refugees. Four times between 1957 and 1962 we have made special provisions for relatives of American citizens or orphans. In addition, each year we are called upon to consider thousands of private bills to accommodate persons caught in the backwash of this origins system.

These efforts at circumvention are further proof that the national origins system is in disrepute. We cannot continue to respect a law we constantly seek to circumvent. To continue with such a law brings discredit upon ourselves as legislators. The national origins system has even failed in the purpose for which it was intended: to keep the ethnic balance of our country forever as it was in 1920. In 1920, 79 percent of our white population was of northern and western European origin. During the first 30 years of the national origins system, only 39 percent of our total immigration came from such areas. Since 1952, some 3.5 million persons have been admitted to this country as immigrants. Two-thirds of them came outside the national origins quota. Since 1952, we have authorized 2.1 million national origins quota numbers. Only one-half of these numbers were used.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical summary of immigrants admitted from June 30, 1953, through June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immigrants admitted to the United States, by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1953–64

Class	1953–64	1953 [1]	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Total immigrants admitted	3,197,857	170,434	208,177	237,790	321,625	325,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763	306,260	292,248
Quota immigrants (total)	1,140,479	84,175	94,098	82,232	89,310	97,178	102,153	97,657	101,373	96,104	90,319	103,036	102,844
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,124,863	78,053	88,016	79,617	88,825	97,084	102,077	97,651	101,352	96,074	90,305	102,995	102,814
1st preference quota:													
Selected immigrants of special skill or ability	30,500	77	1,429	1,776	1,946	2,992	3,941	3,518	3,385	3,460	3,313	2,288	2,475
Their spouses and children	28,676	45	1,027	1,236	1,420	2,739	3,197	3,109	3,681	3,758	3,721	2,374	2,387
Skilled agriculturists, their wives and children (1924 act)	321	321											
Parents or husbands of U.S. citizens (1924 act)	4,290	4,290											
2d preference quota:													
Parents of U.S. citizens	35,847	983	2,783	2,394	2,843	3,677	2,608	3,406	3,451	3,381	2,252	4,006	4,063
Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [2]	2,409								376	931	341	392	369
Wives and children of resident aliens (1924 act)	4,133	4,133											
3d preference quota:													
Spouses of resident aliens	28,450	291	3,180	2,604	2,902	2,848	2,719	3,409	2,767	2,132	1,785	1,832	1,980
Unmarried sons or daughters of resident aliens [3]	36,618	220	2,824	2,821	4,064	3,783	2,668	4,134	3,225	3,265	2,419	3,266	3,929
4th preference quota:													
Brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens	22,406	63	1,556	1,955	1,690	1,715	2,903	2,162	1,956	2,346	2,162	2,187	1,711
Married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [3]	7,928	22	374	1,120	431	1,443	2,029	1,275	425	244	205	199	161
Spouses and children of brothers or sisters, sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [4]	11,580								1,044	2,572	2,548	2,887	2,529
Adopted sons or daughters of U.S. citizens [5]	137								55	62	16	1	3
Nonpreference quota	911,468	67,608	74,843	65,711	73,529	77,887	82,030	76,638	80,987	73,923	71,542	83,563	83,207
Special legislation (quota immigrants)	15,616	6,122	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6	21	30	14	41	30
Displaced persons (Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (quota))	15,121	5,759	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6			3	1	
Skilled sheepherders (act of Apr. 9, 1952 (quota))	363	363											
Foreign government officials adjusted under sec. 13, (act of Sept. 11, 1957 (quota))	132								21	30	11	40	30
Nonquota immigrants (total)	2,057,378	86,259	114,079	155,558	232,315	229,689	151,112	163,029	164,025	175,240	193,444	203,224	189,404
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,681,285	85,015	112,854	126,135	156,808	147,243	125,591	111,341	133,087	152,382	169,346	183,283	178,200
Wives of U.S. citizens	236,980	15,916	17,145	18,504	21,244	21,794	23,517	22,620	21,621	20,012	17,316	17,590	19,701
Husbands of U.S. citizens	73,418	3,359	7,725	6,716	5,788	5,767	5,833	6,913	6,140	6,059	6,646	6,035	6,437
Children of U.S. citizens	70,896	3,268	5,819	5,662	4,710	4,798	5,970	5,869	6,454	6,480	6,354	6,981	7,531
Natives of Western Hemisphere countries	1,227,778	58,985	78,897	92,620	122,083	111,344	86,523	66,386	89,566	110,140	130,741	144,677	135,816
Their spouses and children	27,482	2,114	1,629	1,654	1,949	2,144	2,052	1,810	2,135	2,696	2,764	3,067	3,468
Persons who had been U.S. citizens	902	104	427	87	44	58	43	22	36	15	25	23	18
Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children	5,107	387	385	307	350	403	435	558	485	406	451	462	478
Employees of U.S. Government abroad, their spouses and children	205	2	4	9	2	8	23	24	27	10	3	32	61
Children born abroad to resident aliens or subsequent to issuance of visa	12,117	326	358	348	412	701	926	1,228	1,458	1,411	1,495	1,611	1,843
Aliens adjusted under sec. 249, Immigration and Nationality Act [6]	22,795							4,321	4,773	5,037	3,399	2,680	2,585
Other nonquota immigrants	3,605	[6] 554	465	228	226	226	269	590	392	116	152	125	262
Special legislation (nonquota immigrants)	376,093	1,244	1,225	29,423	75,507	82,446	25,521	51,688	30,938	22,858	24,098	19,941	11,204
Displaced persons (Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (nonquota))	1,030	1,030											
Orphans (act of July 29, 1953)	466		399	67									
Refugees (Refugee Relief Act of 1953)	189,021		821	29,002	75,473	82,444	1,012	198	43	9	15	3	1
Skilled sheepherders (act of Sept. 3, 1954 (nonquota))	385			354	31								
Immigrants (act of Sept. 11, 1957)	61,948						24,467	24,834	6,612	3,982	1,809	213	31
Hungarian parolees (act of July 25, 1958)	30,701							25,424	5,067	122	51	20	17
Azores and Netherlands refugees (act of Sept. 2, 1958)	22,213							1,187	8,870	5,472	4,796	1,888	
Immigrants (secs. 4 and 6, act of Sept. 22, 1959)	29,337								10,314	13,255	5,488	280	
Immigrants (act of Sept. 26, 1951)	15,525										11,912	2,848	765
Other nonquota immigrants (special legislation)	412	214	5		3	2	42	45	32	18	27	12	12
Refugee and escapees (act of July 14, 1960)	6,111											2,005	4,106
Immigrants (act of Oct. 24, 1962)	18,944											12,672	6,272

[1] In 1953 figures include admissions under Immigration Act of 1924.
[2] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, all sons or daughters of U.S. citizens over 21 years of age were classified as 4th preference quota under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Adopted sons and daughters with petitions approved prior to Sept. 22, 1959, remained 4th preference.
[3] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, included only children under 21 of resident aliens. Adult sons or daughters of resident aliens were classified as nonpreference quota.
[4] Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, classified as nonpreference quota.
[5] Not reported prior to 1959.
[6] Includes 321 professors of colleges and universities their wives and children.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from these figures, it was obvious to the Judiciary Committee that the current system is as much a failure as a device as it is an embarrassment as a doctrine. The bill now before the Senate abolishes it altogether.

The new policy in the bill before us was developed under the administration of President Kennedy by experts both in Congress and the executive branch. Extensive hearings were held, both last year and this, in the Senate and the House. The Senate Immigration Subcommittee has sat regularly since last February. We have heard over 50 witnesses. I can report, Mr. President, that opposition to this measure is minimal. Many of the private organizations who differed with us in the past now agree the national origins system must be eliminated.

The current bill phases out the national origins system over a 3-year period. Beginning July 1, 1968, our immigration policy will be based on the concept of "first come, first served." We no longer will ask a man where he was born. Instead we will ask if he seeks to join his family or if he can help meet the economic and social needs of the Nation. Favoritism based on nationality will disappear. Favoritism based on individual worth and qualifications will take its place.

When this system is fully in effect, 170,000 quota numbers will be available to the world, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere. Parents, spouses, and children of U.S. citizens will be considered as "immediate relatives" and, as such, will be under no numerical limitation at all. Due to the existence of backlogs of applicants in those nations discriminated against by the national origins system, an annual limitation per country of 20,000 quota immigrants is established, so that in the short run no one nation will be able to receive an unduly disproportionate share of the quota numbers. It is anticipated that after 3 years, these backlogs of intending immigrants will be eliminated in all instances but for one category of Italians, and that situation will be rectified shortly thereafter.

The total number of authorized quotas is not increased substantially by this bill. Currently, we authorize the use of 158,561 numbers per year, but this is exclusive of refugees. Under the new

law, provision is made for the acceptance of some 10,200 refugees. This is what accounts for the increase in total numbers under this bill from 158,561 to 170,000.

Under our new "first come, first served" system, while all immigrants will be in worldwide competition, we will retain certain preferences and, of course, our traditional stringent safeguards. The preferences under this bill reflect our strong humanitarian belief in family unity as well as personal merit. The 170,000 numbers will be made available in the following order of preference:

First, 20 percent, or 34,000 quota numbers, to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens;

Second, 20 percent, or 34,000 quota numbers, to the spouses and unmarried children of permanent resident aliens;

Third, 10 percent, or 17,000 quota numbers, will be available to persons who can qualify as professionals or people of ability in the arts or sciences who will substantially benefit the United States;

Fourth, 10 percent, or 17,000 numbers, to the married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens;

Fifth, 24 percent, or 40,800 numbers, to the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens;

Sixth, 10 percent, or 17,000 numbers, to qualified persons capable of performing permanent labor for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States;

Seventh, 6 percent, or 10,200 numbers, for refugees as defined in the bill. In any given year, one-half of these numbers may be used to adjust the status of previously paroled refugees who can qualify as permanent resident aliens.

The numbers stated in these preference categories are fixed for the professionals, the laborers, and the refugees. Any other preference category dealing with family relationships receives the unused quota numbers of the preference category before it. Finally, all numbers unused in all the preference categories flow in the end for the use of nonpreference or "new seed" immigrants.

Mr. President, the foregoing is a general description of our immigration policy on July 1, 1968. On that date no nation will have a quota number assigned to it—except for the equalizing limit of 20,000 per nation—and no immigrant will be penalized by his birth or ancestry. Between now and then, we have adopted a simple and equitable phasing-out system. For the 3 years beginning July 1, 1965, each nation will maintain its national origin quota, but the quota numbers unused by any nation will be placed in an immigration pool for redistribution to other nations the following year. We will start the pool out with the 55,600 numbers unused last year. During the 3 years certain parts of the new system will be in effect; no one nation can receive more than 20,000 numbers per year. The immigration pool will be available only to immigrants qualifying under the new preference system. The total number available to the world will be the new total of 170,000. Because refugees are included in our general immigration law for the first time, both the Senate and House committee intended that the 6 percent of our total immigration numbers, allocated to refugees, or 10,200, will be available for use from the pool during the phaseout years. Refugees were never under the national origin system and should not be now: thus the numbers available for this purpose will be present both before and after July 1, 1968.

Mr. President, in addition to eliminating the national origins system, this bill makes other reforms in our immigration policy that support the principles of merit and of first come, first served. I am especially gratified that we are wiping out the Asia-Pacific triangle. Established by the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, this geographic triangle is used to identify those nations of the East to which a specially discriminatory rule applies. Any person, regardless of his place of birth, whose ancestry can be traced to a nation or nations within the triangle is chargeable to the quota of that nation, or to a general triangle quota of 100. The elimination of this crude device means that finally, after almost 100 years, Asian peoples are no longer discriminated against in the immigration laws of our country.

The plight of refugees has been of special concern to us since the end of World War II. Every outbreak of violence between nations leaves its toll in the homeless and dispossessed. Our concern for refugees was capped in 1960 by the passage of the fair share law, under which we agreed to accept up to 25 percent of persons displaced to other lands in a prior 6-month period, if these persons fell under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This law was passed in keeping with World Refugee Year. By placing refugees under our general immigration law for the first time, the bill before us will do away with the main provisions of the fair share law, thus allowing the United States to make its own determination of who is or is not a refugee.

As defined in this bill, refugees are those persons displaced from Communist-dominated countries or areas, or from any country in the defined area of the Middle East because of persecution, or fear of persecution, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. They must be currently settled in countries other than their homelands.

The bill also will make quota numbers available to refugees displaced by natural calamities, as defined by the President. This provision is designed to assure the world that we will remain a haven for the displaced. It means that when situations arise, like the earthquakes in the Azores in 1963, and floods in southeastern Europe, we will be able to assure that the cases of greatest need can be processed at once, while special legislation is being considered.

Another change brought about by this bill relates to the controls exercised by the Secretary of Labor to protect our economy from whatever harsh effects immigration could create. Under current law, aliens who enter to seek employment are excluded from the country only if the Secretary of Labor has determined that their presence would have an adverse effect on the employment or the wages and working conditions of American citizens. Under this procedure, the Secretary certifies that aliens falling under certain occupational or skill definitions should be excluded because they will threaten domestic employment. The new bill reverses this procedure. It places the burden of proving no adverse effect on the applying alien. The intending immigrant must receive a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that his presence will not affect U.S. employment, wages, or working conditions.

Mr. President, this provision was included in this bill to further protect our labor force during periods of high unemployment. But it was included with the intent that it be meaningful only where it has some meaning. Section 212(a)14 of the act which is amended here relates only to those aliens who come here for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor. Hence one would not expect a nonpreference housewife to be forced to seek a specific case clearance from the Secretary.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is talking about aliens who come here seeking to stay permanently under the immigration laws and not aliens who come here for seasonal employment as temporary supplemental agricultural workers?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Moreover, Mr. President, it was not our intention, nor that of the AFL–CIO, that all intending immigrants must undergo an employment analysis of great detail that could be time consuming and disruptive to the normal flow of immigration. We know that the Department of Labor maintains statistics on occupations, skills, and labor in short supply in this country. Naturally, then, any applicant for admission who falls within the categories should not have to wait for a detailed study by the Labor Department before his certificate is issued. On the other hand, there will be cases where the Secretary will be expected to ascertain in some detail the need for the immigrant in this country under the provisions of the law. In any event we would expect the Secretary of Labor to devise workable rules and regulations by which he could carry out his responsibilities under the law without unduly interrupting or delaying immigration to this country. The function of the Secretary is to increase the quality of immigration, not to diminish it below levels authorized by law.

The final major change brought about by this legislation affects the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The bill will modify the current nonquota status of these nations by placing a ceiling of 120,000 on the entire hemisphere, exclusive of parents, spouses, and children. This ceiling, effective July 1, 1968, will place no numerical limit on any one

country, however, nor will it incorporate the preference system in force for the rest of the world.

The bill also creates a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration. This Commission will conduct a complete study of the demographic, economic, and social changes underway in this hemisphere and draw conclusions pertinent to our immigration policy. The Commission will make its first report to the President and the Congress by July 1, 1967, and its final report by January 15, 1968.

Mr. President, there are other amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act in this important bill. Some are of a technical nature, causing the law to conform to the basic change in our policy; others are more substantive. For example, the newly independent nations of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago are included within the definition of the Western Hemisphere by a change in the definition of the Western Hemisphere to include any independent foreign country in this hemisphere. This broad definition, rather than the current restrictive one, will also encompass areas that might gain their independence in the future.

Also, with regard to this hemisphere, current law does not allow for the adjustment of status of aliens who arrive as nonimmigrants from the nations contiguous to the United States or the adjacent islands. In the light of some abuses, whereby Western Hemisphere presons have come as visitors and then sought an adjustment to permanent residents, the current restriction on adjustment was extended to cover the entire hemisphere. An important exception has been made in the Senate committee, however, to provide for those who have fled, or will flee in the future, from a hemisphere nation to escape persecution because of race, religion, or political opinion. This was devised to ease the situation of many Cubans who have entered the United States in recent years.

In general, the various exclusions that exist in our current law have been retained. This bill does, however, recognize the advances made in the treatment and control of epilepsy, and removes persons so afflicted from the exclusions of the law.

In addition, those who are classified as mentally retarded, and those who have suffered past mental afflictions will be treated in the same manner as we currently treat those who are classified as tubercular. That is, the conditions and controls for the admission of such people will rest with the Attorney General. He shall establish the regulations for admission in consultation with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Section 8(c) of the bill is a consolidation of the definition of "eligible orphan" from different sections of the current law. It was meant to merely restate the definition while in no way changing it from current usage.

Finally, alien crewmen who entered illegally will no longer be treated differently than other illegal entrants when seeking an adjustment of status.

This is the bill before the Senate. It was drafted in the belief that, in drafting an immigration law, Congress should provide our country with a source of strength, not a source of problems. We should be responsive to human needs, but mindful of economic realities. We should not add to the difficulties our country is having, but rather try to aid in the solution of these difficulties. I believe that a fair reading of this bill will show that these responsibilities are discharged.

There have been, however, certain questions raised in the course of our hearings that indicated certain fears or concerns in the minds of some interested people. I would like to set them straight.

First was the fear that this legislation would result in a significant increase in overall immigration. As I have previously stated, the number of quotas authorized each year will not be substantially increased. The world total—exclusive of Western Hemisphere—will be 170,000, an increase of approximately 11,500 over current authorization. But 10,200 of that increase is accounted for by the inclusion of refugees in our general law for the first time.

There will be some increase in total immigration to the United States—about 50,000 to 60,000 per year. This results from changing the law from an individual country quota system to a worldwide system. These are the numbers that go unused each year because quota numbers given to a country that are not utilized are wasted. By removing that obstacle to use, all numbers authorized will now be used, thus the increase in immigration will be about the same as the number of quotas now wasted. More specifically, the future use of numbers can be estimated as follows. Under this bill, we will use the 170,000 numbers given to the world, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, and about 60,000 more for immediate relatives. Over the past 10 years we have averaged 110,000 per year from the Western Hemisphere. This should continue, along with approximately 15,000 immediate relatives. Thus we will admit an estimated total of 355,000. This is but a 60,000 increase in total immigration over our average total for the last decade.

We are talking about 60,000 people, in a population nearing 200 million, that is growing, without immigration, at a rate of 3 million per year. The percentage increase that immigration will represent is infinitesimally small. This legislation opens no "floodgate." Rather it admits about the same number of immigrants that current law would allow, but for the national origins restriction.

Another fear is that immigrants from nations other than those in northern Europe will not assimilate into our society. The difficulty with this argument is that it comes 40 years too late. Hundreds of thousands of such immigrants have come here in recent years, and their adjustment has been notable. At my request, many voluntary agencies that assist new immigrants conducted lengthy surveys covering people who have arrived since the late 1940's. The results would be most gratifying to any American. I have only found five case of criminal complaints involving immigrants in our studies of many thousands. Unemployment rates among these people are much lower than the national average; business ownership between 10 percent and 15 percent higher; home ownership as high as 80 percent in one city and averaging about 30 percent elsewhere. Economic self-sufficiency after approximately 4½ months from the date of arrival. By every standard of assimilation these immigrants have adjusted faster than any previous group.

In whatever other defintion we wish to give to assimilate, we would find our new residents doing well. Family stability is found to be excellent; cases of immigrants on public welfare are difficult to find; 85 to 95 percent of those eligible have become naturalized citizens, and so forth.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the people who comprise the new immigration—the type which this bill would give preference to—are relatively well educated and well to do. They are familiar with American ways. They share our ideals. Our merchandise, our styles, our patterns of living are an integral part of their own countries. Many of them learn English as a second language in their schools. In an age of global television and the universality of American culture, their assimilation, in a real sense, begins before they come here.

Finally, the fear is raised that under this bill immigrants will be taking jobs away from Americans at a time we find it difficult to lower our unemployment rate below 4 percent. Mr. President, I have already described the more stringent controls that this bill gives to the Secretary of Labor to insure against any adverse effects of immigration on American labor. I would also point out that this measure has the complete support of the AFL–CIO; support that would not be forthcoming if the fear of job loss for Americans were real.

The fact is that most immigrants do not enter the labor market at all—they are consumers and create demands for additional labor. Since 1947, only 47 percent of our total immigration entered the labor force, while 53 percent became consumers only, providing a net increase in the demand for goods and services. Of our total immigrant work force since 1947, approximately one-third entered professional and technical occupations—a ratio higher than that for our own domestic labor force. Last year alone, some 20,000 immigrants entered jobs defined as critical occupations by the Selective Service System. These are the people whose creativity makes more jobs, not fewer. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables summarizing occupational distribution of recent immigration, which bear this out.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups, for fiscal years 1947–64 and for selected years*

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1964		1964		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted	4,424,460	100.0	292,248	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation	2,077,594	47.0	131,098	44.9	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation	2,346,866	53.0	151,076	51.7	[1] 112,067	53.8	[1] 81,709	55.5
No occupation reported	(1)		10,074	3.4	(1)		(1)	
With occupation [2]	2,077,594	100.0	131,098	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical and kindred workers	343,414	16.5	28,756	21.9	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers	92,180	4.4	1,732	1.3	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm	101,708	4.9	6,822	5.2	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	367,845	17.7	30,015	22.9	16,018	16.7	13,691	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	321,453	15.5	17,568	13.4	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers	279,646	13.5	14,243	10.9	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers	157,306	7.6	8,451	6.4	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household	125,053	6.0	10,396	7.9	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen	78,044	3.8	3,988	3.0	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	210,945	10.2	9,127	7.0	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

[1] "No occupation" includes "no occupation reported" group.
[2] Includes immigrants 14 years of age and over.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE 2.—*Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, fiscal years 1954–64* [1]

	Total, 1954–64	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954
Biological scientists	601	112	81	49	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23
Chemists	6,335	825	814	474	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383
Dentists	1,429	160	177	115	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116
Engineers	36,461	3,660	3,966	2,909	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391
Geologists and goophysicists	659	85	73	88	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34
Mathematicians	345	50	56	39	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14
Nurses	36,858	4,230	4,355	3,700	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502
Physicians and surgoons	18,424	2,249	2,093	1,797	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040
Physicists	1,610	242	216	187	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74
Professors and instructors	4,767	839	761	589	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184
Teachers not specified	27,218	4,086	3,727	3,182	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356
Technicians	17,209	2,448	2,197	1,838	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804
Machinists	10,252	969	897	681	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488
Toolmakers, diemakers, and setters	7,334	423	473	369	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760

[1] The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible, in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1964, annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice; 1954 through 1958, data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In effect then, immigration benefits our economy and labor force, as long as it is selective and controlled. This bill will allow greater selectivity and greater control.

Mr. President, what we are about to consider is the fruit of the efforts of many people over many years: voluntary organizations, who year after year raised their voices against the hardship of the quota system; members of the other body, such as Representative CELLER of New York and Representative FEIGHAN of Ohio, who have vigorously pursued reform; and many others. May I say that my efforts on this subject have been brief in comparison with theirs. If this is an historic occasion, if we are about to take a long awaited step, there are many Senators, here now and with us in the past, whose efforts made them far more worthy of the honor of guiding this bill to passage than those of the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I think of the late senior Senator from New York, Herbert Lehman, who introduced the first bill to repeal the national origins quota system after the report of President Truman's Commission in 1953.

I think of our distinguished Vice President, who cosponsored such a bill in each Congress, and spoke for it around the country.

I think of President Kennedy, who as a Senator sponsored much of the legislation that breached the quota system to unify families and who first proposed the principles of this bill in 1963. I thank the Senator from Michigan, [Mr. HART], who has introduced his own bills in the past, as well as this bill on behalf of the administration.

And I think of all their colleagues who joined with them, year after year, to make this fight. Without their efforts we would not have this opportunity.

Mr. President, George Washington prescribed an immigration policy almost 200 years ago saying:

> The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment.

This bill is in keeping with the wish of our first President, and with the wiser strains of our immigration policy that run through most of our history. After 40 years we have returned to first principles. Immigration, more than anything else, has supplied America with the human strength that is the core of its greatness. Let us keep the strength renewing.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The presentation just made by my able friend from Massachusetts is excellent. He need not apologize for the manner in which he will guide the proposed legislation successfully through the Senate.

I recall that when the Senator's late illustrious brother occupied the White House, he made recommendations to the Senate in this field, and I supported him. I recall that when President Kennedy's predecessor, General Eisenhower, was our Chief Executive and made recommendations in this field, I supported him.

Years ago, legislation tending toward what the able junior Senator from Massachusetts has now presented was passed by the Senate, only to suffer an unkind fate in the House.

In my judgment, the junior Senator from Massachusetts and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary have reported a bill of which all of us may be proud.

Specifically, is it not true that the manner in which the bill applies to the problem of refugees is simply and solely a continuation of the policy first established in the administration of President Eisenhower, carried forward in the administration of the late President Kennedy, and now recognized for the first time, as the able Senator from Mas-

sachusetts has said, in the bill to provide for the amendment of the Immigration Act, which he has presented to us?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from California is correct. As he has stated, the bill includes a provision specifically for the consideration of the refugee problem. This is the first time that refugee provisions have been placed in our permanent immigration law.

The bill contains a definition of the refugees that we will accept, of how they will be admitted, and from what particular parts of the world they may come.

I refer the Senator from California to page 35 of the bill, which establishes quite clearly what we mean by refugees—those fleeing from Communist domination, from the effects of natural calamity, or from the defined areas in the Middle East.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. I shall watch the debate closely.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Before I take the floor in my own right, as I shall do in a few moments, I take occasion to pay tribute to the floor manager of the bill, the able junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The late President Kennedy was deeply interested in this field, and many of the provisions of the bill represent a realization of a dream entertained by him. So it is quite fitting that the bill should be guided to passage through the Senate by his able brother.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts presided over the hearings of the subcommittee which began last February and continued until comparatively recent days. Throughout that time, he always presided with courtesy, with tact, with an understanding of the problems involved, and with an eloquent presentation of his own views on the subject.

I pay tribute also at this time to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who is now presiding over the Senate, and who introduced the bill which formed, in large measure, the blueprint for the consideration of the committee and has culminated in the reporting of the bill now before the Senate.

In paying tribute, I should also say that the subcommittee labored hard on this subject. High commendation is due to the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] for his interest, efforts, and untiring devotion to the work of the subcommittee. His amendments considerably improved the bill.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who is not a member of the subcommittee, but is of the full committee, deserve much credit for the work which has resulted in the presentation of the bill to the Senate today.

I compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for the eloquent presentation and his excellent analysis of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from North Carolina. More than anyone else, he was in constant attendance at the committee hearings, and labored long and hard in bringing this measure to the floor today. To a great extent, his exhaustive probing, questioning, and analyzing brought many worthwhile recommendations for the improvement of the bill. So I appreciate particularly the kind comments of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I desire to mention one additional matter. The distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is absent from the Senate at this time on official business, brought to my attention certain language that appears in the third paragraph on page 26 of the report, pointing out to me that this was not the language that was agreed to by the committee. With his point of view, I thoroughly concurred. Let me now read the language about which the Senator from Florida expressed concern:

> The attention of the committee was directed to the situation which exists with reference to the practices and procedures controlling the importation of aliens to perform temporary services under section 214(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, both as it relates to the importation of actors and other performers and as it relates to other types of employment.

Further, there appears in the report the following language in the last sentence of the same paragraph:

> The Attorney General will be requested to study this matter of consultation with the Secretary of Labor in those cases involving the importation of nonimmigrant aliens under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) and (ii) and report seasonably to the committee the results of his study.

The Senators from Florida expressed concern that the words "and as it relates to other types of employment" which appear in the first sentence of the third paragraph and the words referring to section 101(a)(15)(H) in the last sentence of the same paragraph was not the language approved by the committee, and could conceivably include nonimmigrant farm labor which the committee had no intention of including in the report.

I informed the Junior Senator from Florida that it was the intention of the committee that the language in the report refer solely to the importation of actors and performers of exceptional ability and related employees in the entertainment field, such as theatrical technicians, electricians, wardrobe personnel and so forth.

There is a clear understanding between myself, the Junior Senator from Florida, and other members of the committee with respect to this language that the committee had no intention of including nonimmigrant farm labor in the language agreed to.

I regret that this language is in such a form that it could be misconstrued and want to say very definitely now that the committee makes no change or reference to nonimmigrant farm labor either in the report or the bill before us. As a matter of fact this was made clear in the committee in connection with the colloquy that was had between the Junior Senator from Florida, myself, and other members of the committee.

The language that I have referred to was added to cover those temporary workers who accompany theatrical performers to assist them in their performances and again was not included to refer to nonimmigrant farm labor.

Let me make it abundantly clear that no change is made in existing law with respect to nonimmigrant farm labor and that the language in the report was meant to be confined as I have previously stated to the importation of actors and other performers of exceptional ability and related employees in the entertainment field. I can assure the members of the Senate that had this report not been printed that most certainly the words in the first sentence of the third paragraph on page 26 and those words in the last sentence referring to section 101(a)(15)(H) would be deleted from the report, so that there could be no possible misconstruance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for making so clear the point which has just been clarified relative to the inclusion of certain unfortunate wording in the committee report.

The Senator will recall, as will other Senators, that the Senate recently had a rather sturdy debate on this question relating to the importation of temporary workers for agricultural labor from foreign nations, which workers are not admitted as applicants for permanent residence.

In that debate the Senate was evenly divided, as the Senator will recall. The controlling vote was cast by the distinguished Vice President, which made a total vote, as I recall, of 46 to 45. Shortly after that action, and after the amendment sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida and by my distinguished colleage the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], had been omitted from the farm bill then pending, by the vote of the Vice President, we had heard that there would be included in the immigration bill a provision relating to the same subject and applying in a different way, of course, from that which was pursued by our amendment.

The senior Senator from Florida inquired at once of the committee and the committee staff and found that, just as his friend has now stated, no such provision was included in the bill. It had been agreed in the committee that the bill should make no reference to nonimmigrant farm labor. It had also been agreed in the committee that there should be no reference to the subject matter in the report. However, when the report was available, immediate anxiety was created in certain agricultural circles by the wording to which the Senator has referred.

The senior Senator from Florida at once took up this matter, first with his distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida, and later with the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and with other members of the committee, and found that the wording of the report, if it applied to agricultural labor, was unfortunate because it had not been approved by the committee.

Later we found that was exactly the understanding of my distinguished friend who has so ably explained the provisions of this bill, the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I appreciate the fact that he has cleared up this matter so thoroughly by his statement.

As I now understand it, there is no reference in the bill itself to the subject matter of supplemental agricultural labor from foreign countries coming to this country to help harvest or to help produce our crops, and there is no reference contained in the report. The words quoted by the distinguished Senator from the report were meant to relate and do relate solely to actors and persons in the entertainment field and technicians and specialists who accompany them when they come to this country. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct in his understanding. This legislation before us is a very important, but limited, adjustment to the McCarran-Walter Act. This bill takes a particular part of existing law, as I mentioned in my speech, relating to immigration factors such as the national origin quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle, and the preference categories, and modifies them to remove a longstanding form of discrimination in our immigration laws.

This specific legislation does not consider in any way, nor does the report, the matter which the Senator from Florida has mentioned, though certainly the matter which the Senator from Florida has mentioned is included generally within the total framework of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is included within the framework of existing law, but not included in any way within the proposed changes in the existing law nor within the purview of the report of the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am not surprised that that is the case.

The Senator and I had a short conference on this subject generally as we were going back to our respective offices. I remember that I assured the distinguished Senator that the suggestion might not be presented by those of us who think differently from himself on this subject. I had felt from what I had heard from the committee that a similar situation existed in the committee.

I was particularly impressed that that must be the case when I noted the decision of the committee and the voting in the Senate on the amendment to which I have referred. I found that the Committee on the Judiciary was evenly divided in its vote. Eight members of the committee voted for the position taken by my distinguished colleague and myself, and seven members voted against that position. The absent member of the committee, making up the 16 in all, declared for that position. So there was a division of 9 to 7 in favor of the position taken by my colleague and myself.

It seemed to me impossible in that situation for the committee to have taken any affirmative position on this issue.

I thank the Senator for having made it abundantly clear by his statement that the committee neither in the bill nor in the report intended to or has taken any position whatever on the question of the admission of nonimmigrant agricultural labor.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I join the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] in commending the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has opened the debate on this historic bill in a fashion which will do great credit to the Senate, quite aside from the distinction which it will bring to him. With him, I hope that the hour is at hand when we may achieve a goal which many of us shared with his brilliant brother. I am very grateful for the kind words he has spoken.

I reassure the Senator from Florida that I heard the colloquy with respect to agricultural labor, and I share the view of the floor manager of the bill that there is nothing, in the new legislation which we hope will be enacted, that would change existing law or procedures with respect to the admission of migrants or anybody else. The same procedures and clearance requirements which exist today will remain after enactment of this bill.

I join the Senator from Massachusetts also in the deserved high praise he gave the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], whose keen mind and persuasive speech we all admire, who applied those rich gifts to the development of a record upon which the Senate may confidently act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do the remarks of the Senator from Michigan concerning nonimmigrant agricultural labor apply equally to the report of the committee?

Mr. HART. Yes. We are again confronted with the problem that whatever the report might have contained, the bill does not change a line of the existing law with respect to the admission of that category of agricultural labor, or others.

Mr. HOLLAND. The wording in the report which might be construed as applicable to that field was not so intended, and does not in fact apply to nonimmigrant farm labor.

Mr. HART. That is correct. It should not be so construed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have been involved, as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization since February, with the processes which have led to the presentation to the Senate of the pending bill. I believe I can truthfully say that the bill in its present form is a result of the legislative process working in its finest fashion. The bill represents the combined efforts of many men who entertain divergent views upon many aspects of the legislation; and it represents a compromise of those divergent positions of interested members of the subcommittee on various features of the bill. In its present form, it is a bill which I can support with good grace.

I do not know whether I could have said that in February, because I frankly concede that I believe in the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act; and had I been permitted to have my way in the framing of the bill, I should have retained the national origins quota system of that act.

I wish to say a few words as to the reason why I believed—and still believe—that the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act presents a desirable formula for the admission of immigrants for permanent residence and ultimate citizenship in the United States.

I disagree with the view that the national origins quota system devised by those two great American legislators, Senator Pat McCarran and Representative Francis Walter, is discriminatory either in purpose or in effect. To be sure, the national origins quota system prescribed by the act which bears the names of those two eminent Americans gave larger quotas to certain of the countries of western and northern Europe than to countries elsewhere in the Eastern Hemisphere. It did so for what I conceive to have been a very good reason, that is, because the people who originally came to the United States from those countries and their descendants constituted the major portion of the population, and thus had made the greatest contributions to the culture and development of America.

In making that statement, I do not assert that the people from northern or western Europe, notably from the British Iles, Ireland, France, The Netherlands, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, are superior to persons in other nations. To the contrary, I assert that anyone who believes in the equality of man should share my views, because if men are truly equal, the people who constitute the most numerous part of the population of any nation are necessarily those who contribute most to that country and its development.

The purpose of the national origins quota system under the McCarran-Walter Act was to receive for permanent residence in America, and for eventual citizenship, immigrants who had cultural backgrounds similar to those of the people already here, and who for that reason

were most readily assimilable into our way of life.

When the committee report was filed, I incorporated certain additional views which appear on pages 56, 57, and 58. These additional views set forth in more detail the reasons why I accept as wise the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the additional views be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the additional views of Mr. ERVIN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. ERVIN

While I support H.R. 2580, as it is reported by this committee, and while I subscribe to much of the majority report, I must take exception to parts of the purpose of the legislation, as stated by the majority, and amplify the reasons immigration reform is necessary.

As long as I have served in the Senate, there have been constant and consistent harangues—from lobbyists and well-meaning humanitarian organizations, from politicians and Presidents—to the effect that the national origins quota system, as embodied in the McCarran-Walter Act, constitutes a most invidious and evil discrimination against all the people of the world living outside of northern and western Europe. It has been declared in political pamphlets and in congressional hearings that the Congress in 1924 and that two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate in 1952, declared through legislation that the people of northern and western Europe are superior to those of the rest of the world.

To me, this is mischievous nonsense and sanctimonious propaganda.

The national origins system, just as the system which is encompassed in the present bill, recognizes the necessity for placing restrictions on immigration to the United States. Present law undertakes to assign to each nation in the Eastern Hemisphere a specific quota of immigrants in proportion to the number of Americans whose national origin is traceable to such country.

However philosophers or anthropologists may differ over the correctness of the thesis, the national origins system is based on the proposition that all men are created equal, and that the peoples of various nationalities have made contributions to the development of the United States in proportion to their numbers here. The McCarran-Walter Act is, therefore, based on conditions existing in the United States, and is like a mirror reflecting the United States, allowing the admission of immigrants according to a rational and uniform mathematical formula.

Those who oppose the system do so because relatively larger quotas than they feel are fair are assigned to the United Kingdom, Ireland, France, Germany, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. This is true, however, only because these countries constitute the most numerous groups in our population and, therefore, have made the greatest contributions to America. In support of this I cite the British Isles, which, in addition to supplying us with a substantial part of our inhabitants, has given us our language, our law, and much of our literature.

When it adopted this definite and uniform rule of law with the view to maintaining the historic population pattern of the United States, Congress did not act upon the theory that the people of one nation are superior or inferior to those of another. Rather, it recognized the obvious and natural fact that those immigrants can best be assimilated into our society who have relatives, friends, or others of similar backgrounds already here. Again, to use the British Isles as an example, it is abundantly clear that their citizens are quickly and easily assimilable into our life and culture.

As the Christian Science Monitor has editorialized:

"It is no reflection on the many fine American citizens of all races, creeds, and national origins to recognize realistically that some nations are far closer to the United States in culture, customs, standards of living, respect for law, and experience in government."

In spite of the endless protestations against the much maligned national origins system, there is absolutely nothing unjust in it. On the contrary, it admits immigrants from all areas of the earth on an exact mathematical basis having no relation to political pressures.

On the other hand, the bill which was originally presented to this committee, S. 500, was manifestly unjust, both to the American people and to those from other lands who would like to join us. Badly conceived and badly drafted, every provision was sufficiently complex to induce an acute case of mental indigestion. Almost all of the witnesses defending it differed among themselves over the meaning of several sections.

Other than poor draftsmanship, there were two fatal defects in the bill. First, the mathematical forumla by which immigration is theoretically determined under the McCarran-Walter Act would be destroyed, and in its place immigration would be managed in the virtually uncontrolled discretion of officials of the executive department, subject to political pressures. Second, S. 500 would have done nothing to control Western Hemisphere immigration. To me, the lack of hemispheric restrictions is the one major defect of the McCarran-Walter Act.

In a speech before the Senate on March 4, 1965, I recognized that the present law is not perfect. But I stated then that "I shall not vote to abandon the national origins quota formula until someone devises a better rule sufficiently strong and certain to insure that immigration to the United States is controlled by the rule of law and not by the caprice of men."

For the reasons outlined in the majority report, I now think such a law has been devised and reported by this committee. As the report states, the McCarran-Walter Act has been largely nullified by amendments and special legislation and no longer effectively restricts immigration. New legislation is now in order for both the Eastern and Western Hemispheres—legislation which will restrict immigration within predictable limits.

This has been accomplished by the committee through adoption of a clear and intelligible bill utilizing a mathematical formula with a numerical ceiling applying to the Eastern Hemisphere, with preferences given to the members of families now in the United States and to members of the professions and arts who can make the greatest contributions to our society. We owe a great debt to the House Immigration Subcommittee and its staff for the creation of this system.

The amendment which I offered and was adopted by the Senate subcommittee, and which would place a ceiling on total Western Hemisphere immigration, must be retained if we are to have a fair, restrictive immigration law. This should be the heart of any reform of our immigration laws. The present rate of immigration from the independent North American countries is already alarmingly high, and, coupled with the population explosion in South America, our duty is clear. It is inconceivable to me that we could enact a law with the alleged purpose of eliminating discrimination and, at the same time, continue the most aparent discrimination of all—that is, the nonquota status of the Western Hemisphere.

Retention of my amendment in the bill will finally bring us to the point at which we no longer discriminate in favor of the people of Chile over the people of England, or the people of the Dominican Republic over the people of France, our traditional allies since our fight for independence.

There are, of course, other efficacious amendments to present law, some added by the House and others by the Senate subcommittee; and there are other important reasons for reporting H.R. 2580 than those I have mentioned. However, these are adequately covered in the majority report.

In closing these separate views, I would like to acknowledge my personal gratification, which I am sure is shared by all members of the subcommittee, to the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, for the devotion and tireless efforts which they gave to us over these months of hearings and executive session. Without their dedication, we could not have accomplished our task of processing an intelligent and effective bill.

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I knew, however, as the subcommittee began its work upon the immigration bill originally introduced by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and various cosponsors, that the McCarran-Walter Act had been the subject of prolonged attack, and had fallen into disfavor with a majority of the Members of Congress, and that those who did not entertain my view about the wisdom of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act relating to the national origins quota system had sufficient votes to eliminate that formula from the pending legislation.

That discovery presented to me two possible courses of action. The first was that I might concentrate my efforts in a forlorn fight to preserve the national origins quota system and suffer defeat in such fight without rendering any service to my country, other than that of loyalty to an ideal which I cherished.

The second possible course of action which confronted me was to join with other members of the subcommittee in an effort to present to the Senate the best possible obtainable immigration law, curing the defects of present law, without the retention of the national origins quota system.

I felt that I could serve my country best by adopting the second alternative. That is the reason which prompted me to join the other members of the subcommittee, and particularly those whose names I enumerated in my colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], in fashioning the present bill, which in my judgment represents the best immigration law obtainable at present.

Also, as the Senator from Massachusetts has stated—and he has cited statistics which support his statement—the number of imigrants received in this country in recent years from the Eastern Hemisphere has exceeded the number of imigrants we have received under the quotas established by the national origins system. This has been due, among other things, to the necessity for admitting many refugees who were fleeing religious and political oppression. The fact is, as the Senator stated, that the system is simply not working.

The House subcommittee, and its members dserve the thanks of the country for devising an intelligent, intelligible and precise mathematical formula for the Eastern Hemisphere by which immigration will be impartially determined. Under it, the most important and admirable purposes of the administration will be accomplished far more effectively than would have been true under the original bill. The reunification of families will be achieved, and we will be assured of receiving the best qualified immigrants. The preference system adopted by the House will assure America of receiving the most easily assimilable and most desirable prospects for citizenship.

The House also imposed new labor restrictions on all prospective immigrants which will have the effect of removing their threat to increasd unemployment. Too, it added new and greatly needed security measures without removing any of those presently existing.

This is not to say that H.R. 2580 as it was reported out was a perfect bill, or even one which I could support, for it still lacked the key ingredient of any meaningful reform—that is, a limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. However, the genesis of good legislation was there, and the Senate Subcommittee proceeded with the same resolve and dedication as did the House subcommittee.

Several substantive, as well as technical and clarifying, amendments were added which improved the measure. Among these, is one I offered, to allow alien seamen who entered the United States illegally the same opportunity to apply for an adjustment of status for reasons of hardship after 7 years residence as have other immigrants who entered the country illegally. I have always felt that like people in like circumstances should be treated by the law in a like manner, and I see no reason to treat seamen differently from other aliens. Also, it seems to me that if a man has found a job and a home here and has been assimilated into our society, he should be allowed to remain. This is an elementary proposition, and I am confident the amendment will be retained. However, this is not the amendment which has aroused the controversy concerning the bill in its present form.

There was one serious defect in the bill before us, and in the McCarran-Walter Act; and that defect arose out of the fact that while existing immigration laws placed a limitation upon the number of immigrants receivable from countries of the Eastern Hemisphere, they placed no limitation whatever upon the number of immigrants admissible from the Western Hemisphere.

I know of no one in Congress at the present moment who favors unrestricted immigration. I am satisfied, from my work with them, that all of the other members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary favor reasonable restrictions on immigration, and that such disagreements that may have existed in the past in respect to this point were concerned only with ways in which that objective could be best attained.

I felt that it was unjust to all the people of the Western Hemisphere for the United States to say, "We are willing to have all of you move into the United States," and at that same time place in the immigration laws provisions which would deny them admission, after such a broad invitation had been extended, because of their failure to meet certain labor requirements of the laws. To my mind, there was a certain amount of hypocrisy in the immigration laws which made that proclamation and had that effect. It seemed to me that it was like inviting a man to have dinner, and then digging a pit for him to fall into before he could get to the dinner table.

Accordingly, I thought that, in order to abolish the hypocrisy which our existing immigration laws practice, telling the people of the Western Hemisphere that they are all welcome to move into the United States immediately, we should place a reasonable limitation upon immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere, as we did in the case of immigration from the countries of the Eastern Hemisphere.

I felt that in addition to there being something in the nature of legislative hypocrisy in the existing immigration laws in this respect, it was also a gross discrimination against all the people of the Eastern Hemisphere for us to have immigration laws which specified that only a limited number could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere but that, on the contrary, unlimited numbers could move into the United States from the Western Hemisphere.

For that reason, I submitted an amendment to provide a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has stated, the pending bill, with that amendment, would place a limitation on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere of 120,000 annually, plus the spouses and the children of American citizens who may come from those countries outside and above the limitation.

To enable the immigration authorities to adjust their action to this new limitation, the bill would provide that it would not become effective until the 1st day of July 1968.

To me, it is vitally important for the amendment to be retained in the Senate and for the Senate conferees to insist upon its retention, in the event it should become necessary to have a conference with the House upon the bill.

Those who disagree with the wisdom of my amendment contend that special privileges are warranted by the special relationship which exists between us and our hemispheric neighbors.

I submit that there is no relationship which is closer or more special than that which our country bears to England, our great ally, which gave us our language, our law, and much of our literature. Yet, under the pending bill, those who disagree with me express great shock that Britain, in the future, can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past. They are only shocked that British Guiana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come.

Those who disagree with me on this point say that there is nothing invidious in the discrimination in favor of the Western Hemisphere, because the discrimination "is not based on race, religion, or ethnic origin." They fail to note that every witness at the hearings agreed with me that there was also no discrimination based on race, religion, or ethnic origin in the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act. Yet, those who disagree with me never failed to take the opportunity to castigate that system as discriminatory.

Mr. President, a Greek or German born in England, be he Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, is charged to the British quota. The system allows immigration according to place of birth, just as the present bill does. Under it, a person born in the Western Hemisphere would be charged to the Western Hemisphere ceiling. A man born in the Eastern Hemisphere would be charged to the Eastern Hemisphere ceiling.

This bill creates a commission to study the Western Hemisphere problem, among others. I suggest the possibility that this commission might find that the ceiling which the bill establishes for immigration from the Western Hemisphere is still too discriminatory, since it allows 45 percent of immigrants to come from only 15 percent of the world's population.

I have also heard it said that the ceiling will somehow adversely affect the Alliance for Progress. This is a perverse argument, indeed, since under the labor restrictions imposed, we will take only the best of those we are helping to train. I hope that those in charge of administering the Alliance for Progress will understand the necessity of keeping the best qualified where they are most needed, which is in the Latin American countries.

The substance of my amendment has been endorsed by the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Minneapolis Tribune, the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and the distinguished columnist Charles Bartlett.

On July 17, 1965, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Progress on Immigration." I wish to read this portion:

> Secretary Rusk urges that Latin-American nations remain outside any ceiling, as they are now outside of the quota system. But this well-intentioned position could lead to trouble and ill will in the not so distant future if immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean should grow sharply—as there are signs that it will—and pressure were then built up to limit a suden flood of immigrants for which the country was unprepared. While the entire law is being overhauled, it would be better to place all the nations of the world, including those to the south of the United States, on exactly the same footing.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS ON IMMIGRATION

The Johnson administration has intervened to unsnarl the tangled threads of the immigration reform bill in the House.

Personal animosity between Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, the ranking member, has previously made agreement impossible on a measure to repeal the national origins quota system. In a letter from Secretary of State Rusk, the administration discloses that it does not regard adoption of major provisions of the Feighan bill as too high a price to pay for his support.

The national origins quota system would be abolished immediately, as Mr. FEIGHAN suggests, rather than phased out over the next 5 years. The administration has also softened its opposition to Mr. FEIGHAN'S proposal for an annual ceiling on immigration. It set at 235,000 persons, the ceiling proposed by Mr. FEIGHAN, this figure would be tantamount to a cut of 55,000 from the existing rate. If a ceiling is to be set, it should not be lower than the present level.

Secretary Rusk urges that Latin-American nations remain outside any ceiling, as they are now outside of the quota system. But this well-intentioned position could lead to trouble and ill will in the not so distant future if immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean should grow sharply—as there are signs that it will—and pressure were then built up to limit a sudden flood of immigrants for which the country was unprepared. While the entire law is being overhauled, it would be better to place all the nations of the world, including those to the south of the United States, on exactly the same footing.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor for August 17, 1965, carried an editorial entitled "New World Immigration." I wish to read these words from that editorial:

It would seem that a reasonable, legal limitation on migration from Latin America, if adopted today, could prevent the need to adopt more stringent legislation tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW WORLD IMMIGRATION

Applying intense pressure, the administration struck from the immigration reform bill a measure which many experts believe will have to be faced in the near future. This was a provision which would have placed a limit on migration into the United States from the rest of the New World.

Administration opposition centered on the claim that to impose such a limit would endanger diplomatic relations with several Latin American states. This seems like an inadequate excuse for several reasons. We find it hard to believe that any government believes its citizens have a right per se to migrate to any other country. In the second place, certain of the New World lands themselves place high hurdles before many U.S. citizens where immigration is concerned. Thus Mexico virtually demands that a newcomer, including one from the United States, be financially independent before going to Mexico to live, and there are signs that Canada unofficially discourages immigration of nonwhites, among them American Negroes.

But all such considerations aside, Washington must surely realize that, at any moment, it could face a deluge of would-be Latin American immigrants. The flood of Puerto Ricans which has poured into New York, and the wave of Jamaicans which has flowed into Britain during the last 15 years are but tokens of the vast numbers who might someday wish to leave underdeveloped homelands.

For two crucial facts must be faced. The first is that the population of Latin America is growing more rapidly than that of any other large area in the world. The second is that, on the whole, the Latin American nations are failing to solve their economic problems. Thus the pressure on resources grows and grows. Eventually Latin Americans from many lands may decide to do what Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have done in such large numbers: go to the United States.

It would seem that a reasonable, legal limit on migration from Latin America, if adopted today, could prevent the need to adopt more stringent legislation tomorrow.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 25, 1965, the St. Paul Pioneer Press carried an editorial entitled "New Immigration Danger." In the course of the editorial, the Pioneer Press made this observation:

For example, no more than 20,000 persons could be admitted from the United Kingdom in 1 year, but such countries as El Salvador, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Argentina could send unlimited numbers.

This editorial proceeded to take the position that the better part of wisdom at this time required the placing of a limitation, as this bill does, upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW IMMIGRATION DANGER

Under the flimsy and foolish pretext of making a friendly gesture to Central and South America, the State Department and the Johnson administration propose to revise but maintain numerical limits on immigration from all the rest of the world, but to leave the doors wide open for a flood of Latin Americans.

A revolt against this dangerous and unjustified favoritism is forming among House Members. One of the leaders is Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, backed by many Republicans, but also supported by numerous Democrats. Their efforts deserve backing from the public and from Congress.

What has happened in the House is that the bill to abolish the national origins quota system for regulating immigration has been twisted into a vehicle for a new form of discrimination. While an overall limit of 170,000 immigrants a year is set for all the nations outside the Western Hemisphere, including England, West Germany, the Scandinavian nations and Italy, no limits whatever are provided for the Latin American countries. Furthermore, there is an individual national quota maximum of only 20,000 for each nation outside the hemisphere, but no national limit in Latin American.

For example, no more than 200,000 persons could be admitted from the United Kingdom in 1 year, but such countries as El Salvador, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Argentina could send unlimited numbers.

To call this bill nondiscriminatory is hypocrisy. It discriminates against the nations that have traditionally supplied America with desirable immigrants.

Such a policy does not make sense. If we are to replace the national origins principle with the theory that immigrants should be judged on their character and ability, regardless of nationality, then the Latin Americans should come under the same rules, and there should be a maximum quota for them as well as for others.

This is especially important now because Latin America is rapidly becoming one of the world's biggest surplus population areas. Latin America has millions more people than it can support or educate at decent levels, and is doing nothing to control its population explosion. In Salvador alone some 700,000 people have overflowed into neighboring Honduras. In Colombia the politicians are talking of wholesale exportation of emigrants into other countries because of unemployment and poverty.

The situation obviously could develop into a serious U.S. immigration problem if no checks are provided. Congressman MACGREGOR proposes to amend the House bill to put a yearly ceiling of about 140,000 on all Latin American immigrants, which would be in addition of the 170,000 to be permitted from other parts of the world. This is a generous allowance.

The flood of Puerto Ricans that has poured into New York in recent years, with all their problems of language and poverty, should be sufficient warning to the United States. Without reasonable restrictions, the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean islands could in the future provide a deluge of immigrants that would be difficult to assimilate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 25, 1965, the Minneapolis Tribune, of Minneapolis, Minn., carried an editorial entitled "Immigration and the Population Problem." This editorial commented upon an amendment then pending to the House bill which had been offered by Representative MACGREGOR to place a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, and it referred to the opposition of the State Department to the placing of any such limitation upon immigration. It said this on that point:

The State Department argues that a limitation would be an affront to Latin America. MacGregor answers more soundly that the time to set restrictions is now, rather than when the problem becomes more acute.

His view is reinforced by an estimate from the international family planning conference at Geneva this week that the population of Latin America will increase 3.6 times by the end of this century. The pressure to escape to a more moderately expanding United States is likely to grow.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND THE POPULATION PROBLEM

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican of Minnesota, and House Republicans are trying to put a limit on the number of immigrants from other Western Hemisphere nations. At present there is no quota for them.

The State Department argues that a limitation would be an affront to Latin America. MACGREGOR answers more soundly that the time to set restrictions is now, rather than when the problem becomes more acute.

His view is reinforced by an estimate from the international family planning conference at Geneva this week that the population of Latin America will increase 3.6 times by the end of this century. The pressure to escape

to a more moderately expanding United States is likely to grow.

Indeed, in an era when overpopulation looms as one of the world's toughest questions, there is doubt about the United States undertaking an enlarged role as safety valve for nations which do not control their own numbers.

Present legislation bases immigration quotas on the ethnic makeup of this country in 1920. Quotas for western and northern European countries seldom have been filled. Applications from southern Europe and other areas far exceed openings. Thus some juggling of qualifications is needed.

But the effect of the pending bill would be to boost total immigration from the present 300,000 to about 350,000. About 130,000 now arrive annually outside the quotas from other western hemisphere nations. Without the limitation MACGREGOR seeks, this number could jump sharply.

Regarding U.S. growth rates, the Population Reference Bureau remarked: "At present we are on a collision course that could lead us to catastrophe, timed to arrive only a few decades after our sister nations (if they do not alter their growth rates) have crashed on the Malthusian reefs."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for August 24, 1965, carried a column by Charles Bartlett entitled "Revolt Brewing on Immigration," in which he had some comments to make on this point. I shall read this portion of the column:

Since most Latin governments do not currently recognize their population problems, the imposition of a quota will provoke less diplomatic tension now than it will later when overpopulation becomes acute. Congress enactment of the quota may actually jolt the Latins into more realistic attitudes.

The arguments for establishing the quotas now are so compelling and the diplomatic consequences are so nebulous that some Congressmen suspect that Rusk and Mann are resisting it purely in terms of diplomatic expediency. Their stand on immigration is certainly inconsistent with their refusal to endorse preferential trade arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire column of Charles Bartlett, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLT BREWING ON IMMIGRATION

(By Charles Bartlett)

There are signs of revolt by the House of Representatives against the intermingling of immigration policy and short-term diplomacy in the stand taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the new immigration bill.

Rusk is urging Congress to abolish the individual country quotas that have controlled migration to the United States since 1924. He echoes the widespread sentiment that these quotas are discriminatory and damaging to the Nation's reputation for fairness. But Rusk also urges that the Latin American Republics continue to be excluded, as they have since 1924, from the overall limitation that the new bill will place upon migration to this country.

Representative MICHAEL FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, leading the move to revamp immigration policy, has doggedly questioned the special access of Latin immigrants. Why is it fair, he has asked, for people all over the world to stand in line for quota numbers while South Americans enter the United simply by showing that they are unlikely to become public charges?

FEIGHAN hoped to end this special status in the new immigration law but he met objections from the State Department after the crisis erupted in the Dominican Republic. Rusk and Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann argued earnestly that this move would weaken the U.S. standing in Latin America at a critical moment. Further persuasions by President Johnson induced FEIGHAN to agree to a compromise.

The Feighan bill now before the House requires the President to notify Congress when immigrations from the Western Hemisphere start to rise sharply. Latin immigrants will be subject, like all others, to the Labor Department's certification that they possess needed skills not already available in the pool of unemployed.

But this compromise has not allayed the alarm of some Members at demographers' projections that the population of South America will multiply in this century from 69 to 600 million. The growth of Latin migrations to the United States in this decade, from 95,701 in 1960 to 139,282 in 1964, has added substance to warnings that the time is ripe to erect a dam against a possible flood of immigrants.

The Latin political leaders, with a few exceptions, are so hesitant to acknowledge their population problems that a strong initiative by the Ecumenical Council will be necessary to prod them into a population control campaign. Most observers doubt that the council will produce a fulsome endorsement of birth control this fall. Meanwhile, about 700,000 Salvadorans have quietly overflowed into neighboring Honduras, and the Colombians talk of exporting masses of unemployed workers to Europe.

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota, who proposes to establish an annual limit of 115,000 immigrants from the 24 nations of the Western Hemisphere, points out that the State Department merely wants to postpone the action. Rusk said during the hearings, "I am suggesting that Congress wait until there is a need to do it."

MACGREGOR argues that it will be wiser and more realistic to meet the problem during this reform of immigration policy than to wait until the crisis develops. Communists will maintain that the limitation is new evidence of Washington's detachmen from the hemisphere's problem, but their charges will be softened by the present scope of this country's contributions to the Alliance for Progress.

Since most Latin governments do not currently recognize their population problems, the imposition of a quota will provoke less diplomatic tension now than it will later when overpopulation becomes acute. Congress' enactment of the quota may actually jolt the Latins into more realistic attitudes.

The arguments for establishing the quotas now are so compelling and the diplomatic consequences are so nebulous that some Congressmen suspect that Rusk and Mann are resisting it purely in terms of diplomatic expediency. Their stand on immigration is certainly inconsistent with their refusal to endorse preferential trade arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

The key virtue of the new immigration bill is that it has been drafted in a practical and unsentimental spirit of fairness toward all nations. The preferential treatment of South America cannot be maintained if the United States is to boast truthfully that its new policy does not put one nation or region ahead of another.

Mr. ERVIN. The Christian Science Monitor for September 3, 1965, contained a column by Richard L. Strout entitled "Immigration and Quotas," which makes some significant comments in urging the imposition of limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article of Mr. Strout.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND QUOTAS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—It seems a bit odd, doesn't it, that the United States should cut immigration from England by a third while it jumps immigration from Trinidad-Tobago from a limit of 100 a year to no limit at all?

The House of Representatives has just passed its version of the new immigration law, scrapping the old national origins system and substituting a new system. There has never been a quota system for the Western Hemisphere, and under the House version this situation will continue.

Trinidad-Tobago is only used in this article for the purpose of illustration. Trinidad-Tobago used to be a British colony and as such got the minimum of 100 immigrants a year in the old, "bad" national origins system. However, Britain has made Trinidad-Tobago independent, along with Jamaica. Independent nations in the Western Hemisphere are entitled to send as many immigrants to the United States as they wish, subject, however, to sharp administrative checks by the Labor and Justice Departments.

The generous United States, with 4½ percent unemployment, is throwing open its doors to these two countries at a time when the Socialist Labor government in England is cutting immigration from the Caribbean from 20,000 a year to 8,500. England has decided that immigration is not a cure-all for national problems, even among Commonwealth countries.

Nothing that I write is meant to be critical of either Jamaica or Trinidad-Tobago. The two new nations are delightful islands discovered by Columbus, with mixed populations, the one of about 1,700,000 and the other of around 900,000.

Theoretically, so far as fixed quotas go, their entire population will be able to move en masse to New York City. Actually, however, sharp restrictions are applied to immigration administratively, to protect the American economy from job competition.

The passé old national origins quota system is assailed on all sides today as being discriminatory. But isn't it a bit discriminatory to put a quota of 20,000 a year on England, which last year sent over about 30,000 people, and no quota on Trinidad-Tabago? The Western Hemisphere has always been exempt from quotas. Under the House version of the new bill it would stay exempt. Some Senators say, however, that it is time to bring the Western Hemisphere under the same rules as the rest of the world, that "nondiscriminatory" means what it says.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk wants the Western Hemisphere exempted, however, because it has a "special relationship" with the United States. The United Kingdom does not have this special relationship, it appears.

The proposed new bill puts an overall ceiling of 170,000 on immigration from all non-Western Hemisphere countries. This will be allocated on a first come, first served basis, with preferences to families of immigrants already here, and with no nation getting more than 20,000. No nation, that is, outside of the Western Hemisphere.

Latin America currently has the highest growth rate in the world. Famine and the population may be on a collision course. Can the United States, with all the sympathy and pity in the world, really hope to solve foreign problems by taking in immigrants?

Mr. ERVIN. During hearings on the bill many outstanding Americans appeared before the committee. One of them who impressed me most was a distinguished and eloquent attorney of Wilmington, Del., Joseph A. L. Errigo. Mr. Errigo is the national chairman of the Sons of Italy.

Mr. Errigo disagreed with me in respect to retaining the National Origins Quota System of the McCarran-Walter Act.

After my amendment, limiting immigration from the Western Hemisphere, had been adopted by the subcommittee and aproved by the full committee, I received from Mr. Errigo a fine letter endorsing the proposal.

With his consent, I quote the following words from the letter:

I am writing to congratulate you and to thank you for the excellent position you have taken relative to the immigration bill. Since we have established a ceiling for the rest of the world, it is altogether fitting and proper that we should establish a ceiling for the Western Hemisphere as well. This is in accord with our philosophy of equal justice under law for all.

Those of us on the Immigration Subcommittee know Mr. Errigo to be a persistent foe on all he considers to be unjust law. We know him also as a consistent champion of equal application of law.

Mr. Errigo knows we must eliminate the most apparent discrimination of all—that which gives preference to the people of Chile over the people of Italy, and the people of Cuba over the people of France, our historic allies since the time of our independence.

Although equal application of the law to all nations is my principal reason for proposing the amendment, there is another reason. There is a growing demand for immigration from our hemispheric neighbors.

Immigration from the Western Hemisphere increased by 50 percent in the past decade to our present average of almost 150,000 a year. As Senators know, our own population is also increasing alarmingly; yet 5 percent of the annual additions to our total population comes from Western immigrants, and the percentage is going up.

Of all the countries in our hemisphere, demographers tell us that only Mexico's rate of immigration—and between 30,000 and 50,000 come to the United States each year—will remain stable.

The problem in Canada is so serious, that officials of its Government have considered establishing restrictions to prohibit the great migration to the United States, which like Mexico's has averaged 30,000 to 50,000 a year. Presently, for every professional person who migrates to Canada, two leave, the principal reason being the higher salaries paid in the United States. There is also increasing pressure from the labor force for immigrant passports, this being the product of Canada's greatest domestic problem—unemployment. The unemployment rate in Canada has averaged 6 percent in recent years. If we accept the proposition that an increasing professional force generates employment in the labor force, then we must conversely also assume that Canada's problem will worsen and that migration to the United States will increase.

As my friends who oppose the amendment point out, "the majority of hemisphere immigrants come to us from Canada and Mexico." Although it is certainly true that the immigration from these two countries will not decrease, it is also clear that the time is fast approaching when we will receive even more from the other hemispheric countries.

The bill should not offend Canada and Mexico, because of the distinction it makes between the Eastern Hemisphere and the Western Hemisphere. The bill provides that no country of the Eastern Hemisphere shall be allowed to send to this country in any one year more than 20,000 immigrants, outside of members of families.

The bill places no such limitation upon the various nations of the Western hemisphere, and for this reason Canada and Mexico can continue to send into this country their immigrants free from any limitation other than the overall hemispheric limitation of 120,000.

I spoke a moment ago about the probability—indeed, I say the certainty—that immigration from South America, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands will increase with the passage of years. Undoubtedly it will become unmanageable unless we place realistic limitations on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

Immigration from South America has increased by a fantastic 230 percent in the last 5 years, and by almost 400 percent in the last 10 years. It is approaching the point where it will double each year. The figures for Central America are almost as high. This is not just a trend; it is a threatened avalanche.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I find the able address of the distinguished Senator interesting and informative.

I wonder if the Senator would be so kind as to give the actual figures on immigration from South America, as well as percentages?

Mr. ERVIN. I will have my assistant mark the figures for me and I will give them to the Senator from Tennessee in just a few minutes. While he is doing that and to expedite matters, I will continue with my discussion.

The reason why the immigration from South America, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands is increasing is not hard to find. It is a population explosion unequaled in any other area of the world.

In 1900, the population of Central and South America was approximately 60 million. By the end of the century it will be 600 million. In 1900 1 of every 50 human beings who inhabited the earth lived in the nations of Central and South America; today the ratio is 1 in 15. This great, new mass is not shifting to the broad uninhabited expanse of the continent, but to the overcrowded cities, and then, often to America.

The situation is substantially the same in the Caribbean Island nations, except for the fact that there is less room. There, the population is increasing at a rate of 25 percent every 10 years, although the density of population is already too high for adequate support of the present inhabitants. To use one island as an example, if the present population growth rate of Barbados is maintained, in 200 years there will not be room for all the inhabitants to stand on the island.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] say there is no real hemispheric immigration problem now. They are correct insofar as their separate views were filed on September 15, 1965.

But the problem is coming fast and hard. Both the Attorney General and the Secretary of State testified to this in the hearings before the House subcommittee; and the Members of the Senate should make no mistake about it.

Attorney General Katzenbach and Secretary Rusk stated their preference for waiting until a later date to meet the problem. But a later date we would be enacting special restrictions for a special area. The wrath of the hemisphere would be upon us.

I say the time is now—now, when we are broadly revising our whole policy; now, when we are supposedly abolishing discrimination; now, when it is politically and practically possible.

With my amendment, this is a good bill. To strike the amendment or to emasculate it would be to perform heart surgery on healthy legislation.

Without my amendment, or without its substance, it would be difficult for me to support the pending bill with any enthusiasm whatsoever. But with this amendment, I can support the pending bill with enthusiasm, because I know that it is the best bill upon immigration that can be obtained for our Nation at present.

First Timothy, verse 8, gives us some advice that we should follow in enacting an immigration law. It is more timely than the great poem by Emma Lazarus, which is inscribed upon the monument on Ellis Island. This world is confronted at this moment by a population explosion, and soon millions of immigrants will be begging for, indeed demanding, admission to the United States. The United States will have trouble providing employment for its own expanding and increasing population. Therefore, this is the opportune time to enact an immigration law which is based upon the theory that we should restrict immigration to immigrants whose presence here will reunite families already partially in America and immigrants who have some real contribution to make by reason of their skills to the economic welfare of America.

We should fashion our immigration law in accord with the interests of the United States, and the interests of the United States alone, and not our supposition as to what the thoughts or desires of some people in foreign countries may be. I believe the writer of First Timothy had this in mind when he said, in chapter 5, verse 8:

If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

In advocating the passage of the bill in its present form, I am appealing to the Senate to look after those of our own household by enacting an immigration law which takes cognizance of matters of the heart insofar as it will result in uniting families now divided, and which takes cognizance of the best interests of the United States in restricting other immigration to those who have something to contribute to the economic and cultural development of our Nation.

Mr. President, in answer to the earlier inquiry of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], page 48 of the annual report of the Immigration Service shows that immigration from South America in 1955 was 5,500. In 1960, the number jumped to 13,000. In 1964, it jumped to 31,102. While these figures in and of themselves are not alarming, the trend which they reflect is greatly alarming.

In many nations of South America, most of the land is owned by persons who can only properly be called land barons. They show no interest whatever in taking a course of action which would provide for wide diffusion of ownership of the land among their people. If the United States placed a limitation upon immigration from those countries, notice would be served on land barons that they would have to do something like what is suggested in the eighth verse of the fifth chapter of First Timothy; namely, to look after some of their own household.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, much has been said and written in connection with proposed changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act to the effect that there is something intrinsically evil about the national origins quota system on which the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is based. Indeed, many have sought to picture the national origins quota system as a product of prejudice, bias, and racism, and, as such, an affront to many nations of the world constituting a detriment to the conduct of our foreign relations.

Such allegations indicate a lack of understanding, to put it charitably.

There is nothing in the national origins quota system which has any connotation of the idea of racial superiority or racial inferiority. This system is, indeed, inconsistent with any such concept.

The national origins quotas are based on the ethnic proportions of the American population in 1920, and are so constituted with the express and acknowledged purpose of preventing immigration from changing the national or ethnic composition of the American population.

The wish to preserve one's identity and the identity of one's nation requires no justification—and no belief in racial or national superiority—any more than the wish to have one's own children, and to continue one's family through them, need be justified or rationalized by a belief that they are superior to the children of others. One identifies with one's family, because it is one's family, and not because they are better than other people. For no other reason, one identifies with one's national group more than with others. This is the sole basis of the preference which is inherent in the national quota system.

There is no merit in the contention that the quota system is racist or morally wrong. Individuals, and groups, including nations, have an absolute and unchallenged right to have preferences for other individuals or groups, and nothing could be more natural than a preference based on a sense of identity.

No apology is necessary for an immigration law based on the national origins quota system, and I make none.

Having so stated, I would add that I do not consider the existing law without defect, nor do I believe that the immigration formula in the proposal now before the Senate, if properly administered, will result in drastic or undesirable changes in the patterns of immigration into the United States. The preferences which would be established by this proposal are based, I believe, on sound reasoning and meritorious considerations, not entirely dissimilar in effect from those which underlie the national origins quotas of existing law. Blood relationships and family ties stem from the same sense of identity and preference, and it is most desirable that unification of families be a major consideration in our immigration formula. The bill before the Senate also wisely provides protection for American workers against job displacement by immigrants.

I think the bill has been improved by the amendment added by the Senate Judiciary Committee which provides for a maximum limit on Western Hemisphere immigration. If passed, it would constitute a badly needed improvement in the existing law which has no numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration.

It is inescapable, however, Mr. President, that the major changes proposed are in the formula for immigration and mechanics of selection. There is a larger, and I believe, a far more significant consideration, which has been ignored in considering what changes are needed in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Both the present law, based on a national origins quota system, and the proposed changes now before the Senate, are based on the assumption that the country is underpopulated and could use substantial quantities of immigration to advantage. This assumption, formerly well founded, is no longer true or soundly based.

From a superficial view, it would appear that the comparative population density of the United States might justify a continuation, although hardly an increase, such as is likely under the proposed bill, of the very substantial flow of immigration into the United States. A comparative approach based on overall population density is completely misleading, however.

U.S. population distribution is unique, and destined to become more so. A major geographic proportion of the United States is devoted to agricultural pursuits, but the population density of this area is significantly slight. At the present time, less than 6 percent of the population of the United States is engaged in agriculture, and both the percentage and the number of persons so engaged is steadily declining. Even this relatively small percentage of the population is producing a substantial surplus of food and fiber for the Nation's needs. As the process of mechanization continues, even fewer people will be needed to farm this given area and to produce sufficient food and fibers for the rapidly growing population. In comparison to the 6 percent of the U.S. population now engaged in farming, other countries have the following percentages of their population working to produce food and fiber on the farms: France, 25 percent; Poland, 38 percent; Japan, 38 percent; Argentina, 20 percent; Soviet Union, 57 percent; and Canada, 12 percent.

As a consequence, the distribution of U.S. population is weighted more heavily in urban areas than in other nations. As the population expands, the increased population density falls almost entirely in urban areas.

Even in the absence of any immigration in the next half decade, the population of the United States will shortly pass the 200 million mark. And only shortly thereafter—a matter of not more than 2 or 3 years—there will be 200 million people in the urban areas alone. Our present rate of population growth, even exclusive of immigration, is the highest of any industrial nation. It is the population density in the urban areas of the United States, therefore, on which the need for further major immigration should be judged.

From this perspective, it becomes readily apparent that it is not advantageous to the United States to continue to encourage the massive immigration which prevails under present law, much less increased immigration, as would be the case under the proposed changes.

The wise course for the United States to follow is to limit immigration to special cases based on such factors as family reunification and some forms of political refugee accommodation. These factors could be accommodated within an overall immigration ceiling of certainly not more than 50,000 per year from all sources.

Populationwise, the United States has reached maturity. The time has come for our immigration policy to reflect a corresponding maturity. This is not a harsh judgment, merely a realistic one.

Most of the countries of the world have problems stemming from expanding populations. We cannot solve the population problems of one of these other countries by permitting immigration to the United States, even if we concentrated immigration favoritism on any particular one of them, without exceeding by far any maximum level of immigration yet seriously proposed. We cannot help other nations by weakening ourselves, nor should we if we could.

Without the necessity for balancing the merits of the formulas in existing and proposed laws, therefore, I must conclude that neither is responsive to the national needs. The McCarran-Walter Act was designed to meet needs for immigration which clearly existed before the turn of the century, diminishingly so thereafter, and not at all in the circumstances of the last two decades. The changes here proposed are based on the assumption that the immigration needs of the country three-quarters of a century ago remain the same. The contrary is true.

For these reasons, I cannot support H.R. 2580. Perhaps the realization of the requirements stemming from the increased population density and necessarily uneven population distribution in the United States in the past few decades is not sufficiently prevalent to permit drastic changes toward limitations on immigration at this time. Under no circumstances, however, can the Nation afford an updating of the official acceptance of the myth that we can still benefit from a continuation or increase in the current level of immigration.

I hope that the Senate, in the best interest of the country, will reject the 19th century concept on which this bill is premised, and take no major action until the Congress is at least willing to meet the needs of the 20th century, not to mention the future.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I support the pending legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The bill is modest and right. It falls in America's mainstream of morality and commonsense.

The bill represents a broadly based consensus on the kind of reform that is needed. It carries out goals sought by 33 Senators, from both political parties, who joined with me to introduce this legislation following President Johnson's immigration message to Congress last January.

The heroes, Mr. President, of this long and historic struggle to achieve the abolition of the national origins system of selectivity, are properly tens of thousands of Americans. They have organized through community, religious and fraternal groups to achieve the victory now being consummated in the Congress.

It is to these Americans, who in years past opened their homes, their communities, their businesses to welcome the refugee, the relative and the homeless of the world. These citizens conducted community conferences and urged their national organizations to press for immigration reform. Today is their victory.

It is impossible today to list each citizen, each fraternal chapter, each religious society that shares in this achievement. But two national organizations deserve special mention.

For many years the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference has led in education and information. Through national conferences and community workshops the hopes of Americans for this achievement were effectively directed.

This year an additional citizens group, the National Committee for Immigration Reform, whose outstanding membership is headed by former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, has organized to insure passage of this legislation.

Indeed, this proposal is supported by the most distinguished of our citizens, as well as the humble from every corner of the Nation. It is as though each wants to help brighten the light that shines its welcome in the torch of liberty.

To the peoples of Europe chiefly, but to others as well, the United States has long been a haven of opportunity and refuge. The stream of immigrants who have passed through America's gates are indeed the Nation's true wealth.

Today, America's worth and strength—morally, intellectually, politically, socially, economically—rest upon the contributions of people of many national backgrounds and races. This is the unquestioned genius of the American experience.

Throughout most of our history, accepted national policy was to encourage a free flow of immigration. And even though, beginning in 1882, our immigration history reveals a slow evolution from an open to a restricted policy, the gates stoop open to most until after the end of World War I.

Several things then worked to generate a widspread demand for immigration curbs. Among them were post-war urbanization, economic dislocation, waves of fear, and suspicion, and the degenerate nativism practiced by the Ku Klux Klan and its allies. The Quota Acts of 1921 and 1924 followed.

This legislation of the 1920's marked the turning point in America's immigration policy. A dual control system went into effect, which continues to our time. The first selection of immigrants was through the application of such standards of admissibility as health, literacy, security, and financial responsibility. These are sound and right, and have been retained in the pending bill.

The second control was restriction of quota immigration to a specified maximum number per year based on nation of birth.

No responsible citizen, Mr. President, questions the rightness of any nation to regulate immigration. But more than an attempt to set a reasonable rate of immigration, with reasonable standards, was involved in the dual control system. It was framed by an irrational element—the national origins quota concept, which said in echoing words that the people of some nations are more welcome to America than others. We know the story well. Unjustified ethnic and racial barriers became the basis of U.S. immigration policy.

The end of World War II brought hope for basic reform, especially following America's welcome to thousands of homeless and destitute people through the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. But this hope was short-lived. In 1952, over President Truman's veto, Congress enacted the present basic statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Revision and codification of immigration law was overdue. But so far as the basic selection of immigrants was concerned, the 1952 act followed the discriminatory policy of the twenties.

In his 1952 veto message, President Truman said:

> I am sure that with a little more time and a little more discussion in this country, the public conscience and the good sense of the American people will assert themselves and we shall be in a position to enact an immigration and naturalization policy that will be fair to all.

That time has now come. Moral and national interest reasons justify a new immigration policy. Aside from its racial and ethnic discriminations, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 fails to give sufficient recognition to the principle of family unity. It fails to give sufficient recognition to the great dimensions of the world refugee problem and the urgent need in this country for special skill immigrants.

Little wonder President Kennedy labeled the present law "an anachronism," a system "without basis in either logic or reason," a policy which "neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose."

The major objectives of the pending legislation are:

First, to restore equality and fair play in our method of selecting immigrants. Discriminatory provisions against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, token quotas for Asian and African countries, and implications of race superiority in the Asia-Pacific triangle concept, have no place in the public policy of the United States.

A newcomer should not arrive at our Nation's door apologizing for his parentage and birthplace. Such a system is blatantly un-American.

True, we need a careful selection of immigrants. We should be selective—but not with theories of racial or ethnic superiority.

Congress must enact a statute that will be discriminatory in the best meaning of the word—on the grounds of individual worth and capacity; on the grounds of national security, and of economic and scientific benefit; on the principles of family unity and asylum to the homeless and oppressed.

Such discrimination is tolerable and in our Nation's interest.

On such grounds alone, I urge support of the pending measure—for it removes the purely arbitrary barriers to immigration on the basis of race and national origins; it substitutes a new formula

based on equality and fair play; it applies this formula without exception to the people of all nations.

In referring to the national origins system in his immigration message, President Johnson said:

That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition * * * The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities * * * Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

Mr. President, a compelling priority in any reform bill is the urgent need to facilitate the reunion of families. The measure before us today stresses family unity, and accords nonquota status to the children, the spouses, and the parents of U.S. citizens. There is little doubt this measure goes a long way in solving the most pressing problem in immigration matters—family reunion.

Mr. President, a third objective of the pending bill concerns the economic value of immigration. Selective immigration can help meet urgent manpower needs. This fact is recognized in the present law which affords first preference to immigrants with special skills. Experience indicates, however, that the national origins quota system has inhibited the full use of this preference.

Congress recognizes this situation, and has passed special legislation to permit the nonquota entry of selected immigrants. A good example is Public Law 87–885, to permit the nonquota entry of several thousand specialized immigrants. These were persons certified by the Attorney General as having services urgently needed in the United States because of their education, special training, or exceptional ability. The bill cleared the way for a number of distinguished scientists whose special talents are vital to the performance of important defense work. Nearly 50 hospitals, universities, and research organizations in all parts of the Nation are also benefiting by this special enactment. Under the national origins system these needed persons were inadmissible to our country.

There is a sincere and quite understandable concern in some quarters over the economic impact of the projected change in our method of selecting immigrants. But, I submit to the skeptics, the pending measure will continue the historic value of immigration to our economy.

Postwar immigration trends provide a reliable barometer for the future. Of the 4,400,000 immigrants who entered this country between 1947 and 1964, only 47 percent, some 2,100,000, actually entered the labor force. The percentage figure for 1964 was below this average—some 44 percent. The remaining immigrants were housewives, children, and retired people. But they all have become consumers in the economy.

Of this immigrant work force, some 16 percent, nearly 350,000, were professional and technical workers. Nearly an equal number were skilled workers.

The record will show that the occupational distribution of recent immigrants has coincided with the needs of our economy. When these needs were inadequately filled under the basic quota formula, they were met by Congress with special legislation.

In 1964 alone, over 20,000 immigrants in critical occupations, and listed by the Secretary of Labor, entered this country. Two out of every three professionals were in this category. Recent Labor Department reports reflect a continuing steady demand for qualified workers in many areas. Selective immigration under the pending legislation will help fill these jobs.

In a recent report the National Science Foundation investigated the contribution made to America's professional scientific manpower pool by foreign-born scientists and engineers. The report is directly related to the subject of immigration, the integration of immigrants into our society, and the continued need for specialized personnel. The conclusions stated in part:

Migrations to the United States have generally brought valuable numbers of scientists and persons capable of being trained as scientists * * * It is particularly interesting that the percentage of immigrant scientists in the United States has tended to increase in proportion to the level of scientific imminence.

The majority of immigrant scientists in the United States probably settle down quickly in their new environment and make valuable contributions both to the cause of American science and to the general good of the Republic. Social and cultural maladjustment among immigrant scientists appears to be quite slight.

Despite the fairly large influx of foreign scientists during the 1950's, there is no evidence that native American scientists have been placed in any great disadvantage by their presence. Since domestic institutions of higher education do not yet produce the country's annual needed aggregate of scientists, it would seem reasonable to assume that the American scientific community could continue to absorb foreign scientists at approximately their present rate of entry for some time to come.

Under section 10 of the bill, there is set forth a new directive to the Secretary of Labor for determining the needs for skilled and unskilled workers. Properly administered, I believe these guidelines will enable the American worker to be assured that his job security is not threatened by any new immigration. And it ought not to be threatened. At the same time it will permit a more precise determination of the availability of employment for these particular skills in a specific labor market area.

It is my understanding that when an immigrant seeks admission under these categories as special immigrants or preference immigrants and a determination by the Secretary of Labor is required, the Secretary will make a certification in the case of the individual immigrant. He must ascertain the prospective immigrant's skill and will match those skills with the employment and manpower reports he has available from the labor market area where the immigrant expects to reside. On the basis of such an analysis the Secretary will be in a position to meet the requirement of the law, and provide the type of employment safeguards sought in this legislation.

Mr. President, the fourth objective of the pending measure reflects a sensitivity to the continuing problem of refugees, chiefly those from Communist dominated areas. In striking contrast to the lack of policy in present law, the legislation before us accords a preference status to some 10,200 refugees annually. This authority will provide a needed instrument in our foreign policy, and be a true reflection of all America's concern for the homeless and oppressed.

The inclusion of a refugee preference is progress, although I had hoped the bill would also include a more flexible provision to permit a speedy American response to emergency refugee situations such as occurred in the Hungarian revolution.

The parole provisions of present law, section 245, have been used in the past. This section is not repealed by the pending measure—and this is good. The House report, in outlining the specific use of the parole authority, might seem to attempt to exclude its application to large groups of refugees. At the same time, I would expect this general rule of thumb would not forego in all cases the use of section 245 for the conditional entry of refugees, if such were deemed in the national interest of our country. We cannot predict accurately what the future holds. But neither can we exclude a new Hungary and the terrible toll it will bring in human suffering and refugees. This will test the leadership of our country. The base provision in section 245 of existing law will continue to let our Nation respond quickly in dire emergency situations where freedom and lives of individuals are at stake.

Some 250,000 Cubans have fled to this country since 1959. It was while I served as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees that much of this activity occurred. Their presence here was, and is, a new experience for America. For the first time America found itself the country of first asylum for a large group of refugees. The usual concerns associated with a sudden and abnormal influx of new people which were voiced in those first days have not materialized. The resettlement program for the victims of Castro's tyranny have proved successful. They will stand to the credit of the people of our own country.

The measure before us includes a provision affording the Cuban refugees the opportunity for adjustment of status from parolee to permanent resident. This provision is along the lines of a bill I introduced earlier this year. This is an important and needed provision for many who seek permanent asylum in our country.

The United States has also had a positive experience with the more than 30,000 Dutch-Indonesian refugees admitted to this country, under special legislation, following their expulsion from Indonesia in the late fifties. Today some of these expellees remain in unset-

tled status in the Netherlands. These people also are deserving of additional resettlement opportunities in this country. The record on this bill should indicate there is a general awareness of the Dutch-Indonesian refugee problem, and that every effort should be made to provide resettlement opportunities within the framework of the pending legislation.

Mr. President, I have discussed briefly the desirable goals this bill will achieve. There is still another reason why I support the legislation. It is a basic reason, but one which too often escapes consideration. A plain and simple fact is this: the national origins quota system has never worked.

The statistical record of immigration presented in this debate, and in the hearings, demonstrates conclusively that the national origins system is unworkable and out of step with reality. Even on its own terms, and quite apart from any special legislation, the system failed in its purpose to select and admit immigrants in accordance with a basic racial and ethnic ratio.

Some will argue the special measures have brought refinement to our immigration policy. Have they really, Mr. President? I think not. For these efforts stop far short of a stable and permanent policy to which the people of this Nation can point with pride and accomplishment.

A brushfire approach to immigration and refugee problems does not satisfy the requirements of a useful immigration policy. The national origins quota system is widely and unfavorably known. The temporary exceptions which modify it beyond recognition, and make it contemporarily workable, are not known.

Thus America suffers needless stigma abroad, which blemishes the leadership we claim is ours; which hampers our relations with other countries.

The pending legislation sets the record straight by updating our basic statute to conform more fully with our actual practice in the last several years.

Mr. President, the national origins quota system was conceived in a radical period of our history—a period of bigotry and prejudice. Thirty years later the system was reaffirmed—again in an atmosphere of fear and suspicion.

A measure of greatness for any nation is its ability to recognize past errors in policy, and its willingness to reform.

Today is a time for such action on the oldest theme of our Nation's history.

Even among those who favor the bill, there are many perspectives. Each person sees it through a different window and through prisms colored by prejudice, personal increase, idealism, and logic.

To a Polish-American housewife in Detroit, the bill means an opportunity to bring her father and brothers to this country, thus reuniting the family.

To a Coldwater, Mich., manufacturer of medical supplies, the bill means the opportunity to import a skilled East Indian skeleton assembler, a man whose skills cannot be found in this country.

To professors at a midwestern university, the bill means that they may be able to enlist the help of a highly-trained Japanese heart disease researcher.

To State Department officials, the bill represents a public relations coup that will relieve them of the necessity of explaining away what to many nations must seem an inconsistency in American thought.

To those of us in Congress who have pressed for this legislation, enactment may represent the chance to point out the fulfillment of a campaign promise.

And there is an Italian gentleman in Boston—whom I know through correspondence—who is delighted with the bill because it will let more Italians in and he thinks Italians are better than anyone else—exactly the sort of thinking that the bill seeks to get us away from.

And, of course, there are those thousands who are eager for enactment because current immigration policy seriously offends their sense of fair play, their loyalty to the treasured philosophies of Jefferson.

Yet, all of these viewpoints—favorable to the bill as they may be—must be considered subordinate to a greater perspective—the view that history will take on our actions here.

The viewpoint must necessarily be a very benign one. Because here is what this bill says:

It says that we have the right to limit the numbers who may come here.

It says we have the right to set qualifications to insure that newcomers will be loyal, law abiding, sound of mind and body.

It says that the unification of families is clearly desirable.

It says we have the right to say that those who come should bring a skill that will be useful to our society.

But what it says most clearly is this:

The desirability of any immigrant does not depend on his place of birth.

And that is why history cannot but applaud this action.

Because this bill confirms the notion—so often cherished in words but too seldom practiced in deed—that a man's ability to serve, to contribute, does not depend on his race, color, or birthplace.

When history counts the steps that were taken toward human dignity, toward world understanding, toward good feeling among men, when history counts the measures this Nation took to establish the principles of equality, to set an example of compassion, and to treat all men with equal grace, this legislation, this immigration bill, which I am proud to have introduced, will not go unmentioned.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I wish to express my great appreciation for the comments of the Senator from Michigan this afternoon. I believe they will provide Members of the Senate with an understanding and enlightenment which will be extremely important during the next few days of debate.

I believe every Senator realizes that it was the Senator from Michigan who introduced administration bill S. 500. So this is a matter in which he has been deeply interested. He has served well as a member of the Immigration Subcommittee and he has displayed his deep interest by following the hearings closely and by making a major contribution to the development of this bill. I have always looked to him for guidance and understanding in meeting the many problems that we faced in revising the immigration laws.

I believe his statement this afternoon will be most helpful to the Senate. I commend the Senator from Michigan for his fine presentation and thank him again for his great assistance.

If this bill is successful in the Senate—and I am confident it will be—we can trace one of the important lines leading to the acceptance and adoption of the measure by the Senate to his personal interest and commitment to this question.

Mr. HART. I am grateful for the kind words of the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall share with him an excitement and sense of joy when the happy hour arrives and the roll is called and the bill becomes law under his management.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it gives me a great sense of satisfaction to vote for H.R. 2580, the immigration bill. For those of us who have had to work with the existing laws and to witness the little tragedies the national origins test has caused to so many, it is, indeed, a fine day and a fine opportunity.

The real strength of our country comes from the diversity of our citizenry, joined by common goals, not common pasts. We are a nation of people devoted more to the future than preservation of what has gone before.

We have drawn upon the history of every nation and people to form our country and shape our thoughts, but we have gone beyond them all to mold a single, distinct culture.

The bill before us now promises greater opportunity for all of us to benefit from the thoughts, ideas, and desires of the rest of the world. As a nation we shall benefit far more from the removal of the national origins test than will any single immigrant, or all of them together.

Fears that this bill is an "Open, Sesame" are unfounded. In many respects it tightens the law. It gives the key to the golden door, primarily to families of Americans and to those others whose talents and skills we need.

I am proud, Mr. President, to vote for this bill. It does not do all I should want it to do, but I support it strongly nevertheless. I submitted for myself and Senators INOUYE, BREWSTER, GRUENING, HARTKE, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MORSE, RANDOLPH, and YOUNG of Ohio, Amendment No. 56 to S. 500, the Senate version of the pending legislation. This amendment would have permitted people from Bermuda, the Bahamas and certain of the Antilles to be considered in respect to our immigration policy as citizens of the Western Hemisphere instead of as citizens of subquota areas. From 1921 to 1924 the adjacent islands to the United States were excluded from those countries which had quota restrictions. These islands were, in fact, given the status which the bill before us accedes to the new republics such as Trinidad-Tobago.

The present bill contemplates, under the Western Hemisphere rule, only those countries which are independent and thus continues the hardship on the small island areas which can never become independent because of their accident of location, size and lack of natural resources. Yet, from 1921 to 1924, these adjacent islands enjoyed the same benefits as the rest of the Western Hemisphere. These islands will be grouped now ultimately into the world quota and, as a consequence, face a potential of no possibility of immigration to the United States.

It does seem incongruous that less than one-half of 1 percent of the total Western Hemisphere population should be excluded from consideration with the other 99½ percent.

I do not propose to offer my amendment from the floor at this time. Nothing should impede the progress of this legislation. I intend, however, to introduce legislation in the next session to allow people from the adjacent islands to immigrate as do all others from the Western Hemisphere nations. We should not permit such petty inequities to continue. I hope others will join me in this effort.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the rule of germaneness still in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the rule of germaneness expired 9 minutes ago.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in defense of the position taken with respect to the actions of the United States in the Dominican Republic by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

To my deep regret, this puts me in opposition to my good friends the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

I had occasion to call to the attention of Senators earlier this week a most interesting article which appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times, written by the able and veteran reporter, Tom Wicker, the principal Capitol Hill reporter for the New York Times, entitled "Winds of Change in the Senate."

In his article Mr. Wicker commented, and I think with reason, that the art of debate appears to have been more or less lost in this body to which I am so proud to belong.

Possibly even by speaking to a completely empty Chamber on a Friday afternoon—which I regret to state is usually the case when I rise to address the Senate—I hope I can do a little to revive the tradition of debate which down through the years has made our legislative body an institution of which I hope the American people are still proud.

Before addressing myself to the substance of the disagreement between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the three other Senators whom I have mentioned, I should like to make four preliminary remarks.

First, nobody—I repeat nobody—least of all the Senator from Arkansas—has attacked the President of the United States for what he did in the Dominican crisis. The position of the Senator from Arkansas, with which I agree, is that the President got bad advice—very bad advice. But having received that advice from individuals in his administration whom he had good reason to trust, particularly advice with respect to facts which turned out to be wrong, the President had no alternative except to do pretty much what he did. Therefore, I would make it clear that neither the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] nor I, despite what the three Senators have said to the contrary, have said one single word in criticism of the President.

My second point is that what may or may not have happened when the President called certain legislative leaders to the White House to discuss the crisis in the Dominican Republic, after he had decided to send the Marines in, but before they had actually gone, is entirely irrelevant to the points raised by the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Arkansas has no responsibility whatever for the decision made at the White House. He was in no position at that point to disagree with what the President recommended, because his sources of information were no different from those of the President. I believe it grossly unfair for the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to criticize the Senator from Arkansas for having remained silent at the White House after the President announced he was going to send in the troops.

In fact, the Senator from Arkansas said in his speech that he agrees that it was probably necessary to send a small force of Marines into Santo Domingo to protect American lives, particularly in view of the intelligence information, much of it inaccurate, which had come to the White House at that time. I agree with that, too. I believe we were under an obligation, despite our treaty obligations to the contrary, to send in a small force to protect American lives.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that no American lives were lost. Despite the gross exaggeration with respect to the alleged danger under which Americans and other foreigners found themselves in Santo Domingo in those critical days toward the end of April, not one single American life was lost.

So I reiterate that, in my opinion, the Senator from Arkansas is subject to no just criticism because he did not object when the President, at the White House, announced that he had decided to send in the Marines. This argument is especially irrelevant to any issue raised by the Senator from Arkansas in his carefully thought-through and closely reasoned speech. I hope we shall hear no more in criticism of the Senator from Arkansas for what he did or did not do at the White House conference.

My third preliminary comment is that the Senator from Arkansas based his speech on 6 weeks of testimony in executive session before the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which practically every witness from the administration who participated in the Dominican crisis, with three exceptions, was heard and examined at some length by members of the committee. The speech was based also on newspaper articles, weekly news magazine articles, and other information from reputable American journalists, information which was available to the Committee on Foreign Relations as well as to the three Senators I have mentioned.

I sat through those hearings. I either heard the testimony—and I usually did hear the testimony and the cross-examination—of each of the witnesses, or, if I could not be present, I went to the committee room later and read the testimony, including the cross-examination. I can testify from my own personal knowledge that the comments of the Senator from Arkansas are fully and accurately documented by the classified record in the files of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If any Senator doubts what I say, I urge him or her to read that record.

I do not know whether the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], or the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] have read that record. Perhaps they will tell us in due course. However, I do know that, with the possible exception of a total of approximately one-half hour, when one of those Senators may have been present at one of those hearings, they did not show up at all. Therefore, their criticism of what the Senator from Arkansas has said is not based on any knowledge of that record in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This is not necessarily a cause for serious criticism. No doubt the Senators have other sources of information than those which were available to me and to the Senator from Arkansas and to the members of the committee. They are certainly entitled to come in on the floor of the Senate and say whatever they think about it.

The point I want to make is that every single statement of the Senator from Arkansas is carefully documented in the official record of the hearings over which he presided. I raise several questions as to whether these other three Senators can document what they have said.

The fourth preliminary point that I should like to make is that the real issue with respect to the Dominican Republic is not: "Did we do the right thing or did we not do the right thing? Did we, as the Senator from Arkansas says, react too slowly in the first place and then overreact in the second place? Were our activities on the whole in the best